

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 10 and 11 remain pending in the present application. Claim 12 has been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1 and 10 are objected to because of antecedent basis issues. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 3-5 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants have provided support in the specification for the terms "a cup-shaped outer member" and the outer member defining "a fully open end". Regarding "a cup-shaped elastomeric member" and the elastomeric member defining "a fully open end", these terms have been corrected in amended Claim 1.

Regarding "a cup-shaped outer member" defining "a fully open end" and the amending of the specification, Applicants believe Figures 1-3 and the specification in paragraphs [0021] and [0022] as originally filed provide support for the amending of the claims and the specification. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mackovjak (U.S. Pat. No. 4,721,325). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 12 defined a low friction member disposed between the inner member and the elastomeric member. The low friction member being separate from the elastomeric member.

Mackovjak, U.S. Pat. No. 4,721,325 fails to disclose this low friction member. The Examiner apparently agrees with the Applicant on this lack of disclosure of a low friction member in Mackovjak since in the rejection of the claims based upon Mackovjak, the Examiner did not identify any element or disclosure in Mackovjak of the low friction member. Applicants have reviewed Mackovjak and are also unable to identify this element in Mackovjak.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 12 patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Claim 12 depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 12 and Claim 12 has been cancelled.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 3-5, 10 and 11, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2004

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg